



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion with Cicero. Such a course would suffice to give the student a general outline of the constitution in the time of Cicero. It would help him to group the isolated facts and to connect them with such facts of American history as he may know. It would make the facts a part of his intellectual stock in trade and enable him to read Latin with more facility. He would gain a larger insight into Roman life and thought and become more interested in his work.

In Colleges and Universities courses in Roman constitutional history and law are naturally provided in the Department of History. I prefer a course in constitutional history to one in constitutional law, because the history deals more with causes and effects, with the working of the constitution, and with the characteristics of the different periods. Hence, it makes the subject easier, more interesting, and more instructive. It seems also to be more in harmony with the point of view, the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race, as is indicated, for instance, by the fact that courses in English constitutional history are numerous, but courses in English constitutional law are few and technical.

In conclusion, Roman constitutional history describes the greatest and the most national work of an imperial people—the chief factor of Roman civilization; it is an indispensable aid to the student of Roman history and literature, it enlightens him regarding one of the most important forces in European civilization; and accordingly it should constitute an essential, though not necessarily a large, element of all classical education, whether in High School or University.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

JOHN E. GRANRUD.

SUBTERFUGE THROUGH THE MEANS OF LANGUAGE

According to the Old Testament narrative, a famine had been raging in the land of Canaan, and the sons of Jacob went to Egypt to buy grain. They had an interview with their brother Joseph, who was at that time viceroy of Egypt. He did not speak his native language to them and pretended not to know them. They supposed that he still was a slave in a foreign country and so did not recognize him. They conversed among themselves, but did not imagine that he understood them; for he spoke unto them through an interpreter. Thus Joseph held aloof and temporarily concealed his identity (Genesis 42.23).

It may happen, however, that a person wishes to address a particular individual in the presence of others. To preserve secrecy, he must employ a language that is known only to the person addressed. It is said (Plutarch, *Moralia*, *De Defectu Oraculorum*, 5) that in the time of the Persian wars the barbarians sent an envoy to the oracle of Apollo Ptoūs. The priest, who was accustomed to return the oracle's answers in Aeolic Greek, spoke to the Persian in the barbarian language so that none of the assistants understood a word. By this they were given to understand that it

was not lawful for the barbarians to have the use of the Greek tongue to serve their pleasure¹.

In war one can in his own tongue safely address his compatriots serving in the enemy's ranks (Herodotus 9.98). Before the battle of Mycale, the Persian ships were drawn up on the shore and a strong land force was arranged in battle array to meet the Greeks. Leotychides, the Greek commander, then sailed along the shore and by the voice of a herald addressed in Greek the Ionian contingent enrolled under the standard of the Greek King:

'Men of Ionia, ye who can hear me speak, do ye take heed to what I say: for the Persians will not understand a word that I utter'.

It may happen that a legate in parleying with the enemy in the presence of his fellow-countrymen wishes to speak a tongue that is unknown to his kinsmen (Old Testament, II Kings 18.13 ff.; Isaiah 36. 11-13; Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaeorum* 10. 1.2). In the fourteenth year of the reign of King Hezekiah, Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them. The Assyrian then sent Tartan and Rabsharis and Rabshakeh from Lachish with a great host against Jerusalem. When the Assyrians had called to the Hebrew king, there came forth Eliakim, Shebna, and Joah, the most intimate friends of Hezekiah. Rabshakeh, who was skilled in Hebrew, addressed the three men in their own language, saying that he would destroy the city. Then Eliakim with his companions was disturbed because the populace heard the speech of Rabshakeh and said:

'Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it; and talk not with us in the Jews' language in the ears of the people that are on the wall'.

But the general, perceiving in what fear they were, with a louder voice, demanded the surrender of the city in the language of the Jews.

It may happen that a man has to speak a foreign language to hide his identity and escape assassination or he may speak a number of tongues to cause amazement in the people with whom he associates. As Hannibal in 218 B. C. was advancing toward Etruria, Longus attacked him (Cassius Dio, *Zonaras*, 8. 24.8, in Boissvain's edition, 1.206. Appian, 7.2.6, in describing this event does not mention the languages). Many fell on both sides, and, after having entered Ligurian territory, Hannibal delayed for some time. He was suspicious even of his own men and trusted no one. He frequently changed his costume, wore false hair, and appeared at various times as a young, a middle-aged, and an old man. He knew a number of languages, including Latin, and so he spoke different languages at different times. Like Harun-al-Rashid, he frequently made the rounds of his camp both night and day and, in the guise of a person different from Hannibal,

¹In this connection compare Cicero, *De Divinatione* 2. 56: *Quis enim est, qui credat Apollinis ex oraculo Pyrrho esse responsum: Aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse? Primum Latine Apollo numquam locutus est.*

listened to conversations. According to Appian, he made these changes to increase the admiration of the barbarians, who thought that he partook of the divine nature.

A spy, by all means, must be able to speak the language of the people among whom he mingles. C. Mucius² in 508 B. C. had gone to slay Porsena, the king of the Etruscans (Dionysius Halicarnassus, 5.28; Plutarch, Publicola 17). When he came to the camp of the enemy, he entered, passing as a native, since he spoke the Etruscan language³, which he had learned as a boy.

Two centuries later, when the Romans were again in conflict with their northern neighbors, Marcus Fabius, the consul's brother, undertook to explore the Ciminian forest. Having been educated at Caere, he was perfectly acquainted with the Etruscan language (Livy, 9.36). It is said that his only companion was a slave who had been reared with him and who also knew the language. They set out in the guise of shepherds. Their knowledge of Etruscan and their costume concealed their nationality, but they were also materially aided by the fact that no one expected a stranger to pass through the Ciminian forest⁴.

In war the enemy may be deceived by hearing their own dialect or language spoken on the opposite side (Thucydides, 3.112). In the Peloponnesian War (426 B.C.) the Athenian general Demosthenes set out after supper to attack the Ambraciots. At dawn he fell upon them while they were still in their beds and had no knowledge of his movement. In fact they imagined that his forces were their own countrymen, for Demosthenes had purposely posted the Messenians first, with orders to address the Ambraciots in the Doric dialect and so create confidence in the sentinels.

According to Livy, 1.27, the Roman king Tullus took advantage of the fact that a portion of the enemy understood Latin. In a battle with the Etruscans, his Alban allies were defeated. A horseman came to the king at full speed and reported the flight of the Albans. In a voice sufficiently loud for the enemy to hear, the king said to the horseman that the allies had made that move by his command, in order that they might attack the enemy in the rear. In the ranks of the Etruscans were some troops from the town of Fidenae, which had been made a Roman colony, but had revolted and had again joined the Etruscans. Some of these soldiers understood Latin, and, taking Tullus's sham command in earnest, retreated. Whether Livy winks⁵ or not when he narrates this story, the story illustrates the same principle as the quotation from Thucydides.

In this connection we may compare the precautions that the Romans took in the Latin War (Cassius Dio,

Zonaras, 7.26.1-2, in Boissevain, 1.90; Livy, 8.6). The consuls knew that, if strictness of command had ever been enforced in any war, it was then particularly requisite that military discipline of the ancient type should obtain. Their attention was especially directed to this point because the enemies with whom they had to deal were the Latins, a people who used the same language⁶ and who had the same military institutions as themselves. In order that the soldiers should make no mistake, the consuls commanded that no person should fight with any of the enemy except in his post.

We have seen that Hannibal knew a number of languages. In the year 208 B. C., he sent a message to the citizens of Salapia through a fictitious deserter (Cassius Dio, Zonaras, 9.9.2-3, in Boissevain, 1.246-247; Livy, 27.28). About the fourth watch the Carthaginian approached Salapia in the guise of Marcellus, who had been killed in battle and whose signet-ring Hannibal had been using in sending letters to the Romans. His vanguard was composed of Roman deserters, armed in the Roman fashion. When they came to the gate, his men spoke Latin and ordered the watchmen to admit them since the consul was at hand. The stratagem failed. The Salapini, having been informed of Hannibal's artifice, artfully pretended to believe that Marcellus was actually approaching. They admitted as many as they could conveniently dispose of and then closed the gate.

It may also happen, however, that a person will try to hide his identity, not by speaking a particular language, but by keeping silent and pretending not to know his native speech. In 214 B. C., Achaëus was in a dangerous situation at Sardis, and Sosibius thought that he could best save him through the agency of Bolis. Cambylus, the commander of the Cretan contingent of the army of Antiochus, had charge of the outposts on the rear of the Acropolis. Bolis had an interview with Cambylus and treacherously undertook to put Achaëus into the hands of Antiochus on condition of receiving a certain sum of money. A man by the name of Arianus took letters from Nicomachus and Melancomas, which exhorted Achaëus to trust Bolis and Cambylus. Bolis and Arianus ascended to the Acropolis at Sardis and interviewed Achaëus. Achaëus took vain precautions, saying that it was impossible for him to leave the citadel at that moment but that he would come later (Polybius, 8.21). Achaëus then started with four companions whom he dressed in ordinary clothes, while he himself put on a mean and common attire and disguised his rank as much as possible. He selected one of his four companions to be always prepared to answer anything said by Arianus and to ask any necessary question of him, and bade him say that the other four did not speak Greek. But in spite of the fact that he did not speak Greek, he was

²Livy, 2. 12. 5, in recording this incident, makes no mention of Mucius's use of Etruscan.

³Livy, 9. 36: habeo auctores vulgo tum Romano pueros, sicut nunc Graecis, ita Etruscis litteris erudiri solitos.

⁴For Decimus Brutus's failure to pass himself off as someone else see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.75. For the case of Orestes and Pylades in the Choephoroi of Aeschylus see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.75-76.

⁵Compare M. H. Morgan, *Addresses and Essays*, 13-14.

⁶Compare Livy, 24.47. At the capture of Arpi by the Romans, the Arpians were, at the beginning of the conflict, on the Carthaginian side. Some of the Arpians and some of the Romans, recognizing one another, began to enter into conversation.

recognized by Bolis, brought to Antiochus, and executed.

It is perfectly natural, under certain conditions, for one to use a certain language to win the confidence of the enemy, to deceive them, or to ensnare them. We can discuss subjects in the presence of our kinsmen and keep them secret by using a foreign language. A spy must naturally know the language of the enemy, and, the greater his ability in the foreign tongue, the safer he will be, provided he has taken the other necessary precautions. A general may even conceal his identity among his own allies by speaking different languages at various times. We must not be surprised, however, that our authorities do not give us more illustrations. The anecdotes related are simply incidents in matters of greater importance, but it is interesting to note the human touches that the classical authors give to their works.

SOUTH PHILADELPHIA
HIGH SCHOOL FOR BOYS.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

DR. AVELLANUS'S REJOINDER

Professor Charles Forbes, of Phillips Academy, Andover, has reviewed two of my recent translations with such careful attention to the niceties of language and with such scholarship in his field of preparatory Latin, he has moreover in the introductory paragraphs of his reviews granted such a generous measure of praise for the features of my work which met his approval that I am hardly prepared for the violence of my final condemnation.

Of my Latin version of Ruskin's *King of the Golden River*, Professor Forbes said in *The Classical Journal* 11.28:

"It must be confessed that there is a dash and go to the story, a fluidity of expression, and a virility that command even our recalcitrant approval. The translation sweeps along with a determined rush, as a river should, but with the tokens of its travels in the flotsam of its waters".

Metaphors are mixed, but the praise is generous and acceptable. But Professor Forbes says again (31-32):

"That one should imagine it possible to beget a love for a foreign language by a *tour de force* in the creation of a literature offhand of a character that has no counterpart in that language, is suggestive of little else than an enthusiasm *informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum!* It is the imperative duty of those who believe in the worth of the authors of antiquity to prevent the furtherance of what I cannot but regard as a treacherous blow at the very existence of Latin in our schools."

This is nearly unmeasured condemnation and what is my crime? In 30 pages I used 267 words not found in the whole range of Cicero, Caesar, Nepos or Vergil. A critic not "recalcitrant" would probably think that in translating a modern fairy story I had done well to come so near the ancient tongue, but indeed the appraisal of my work is still better, for my critic admits that 109 of these 267 offenders are in fact classical and that the remainder are Latin—early or late. His adverse judgment nevertheless stands. The censured words are designated "flotsam"—although the word *flotsam* itself is early English and, like several other words in the short quotation first given, is not found in the whole range of the books of the Bible.

This sort of criticism—with others—Professor Forbes develops in his review of my Latin version of *The Adventures of Captain Mago*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.149-151.

"The Latin version . . . is certainly entertaining, and the reviewer is deeply grateful to the translator for the pleasure which he has afforded him. The story is full of bold adventures, dashing fights, varied scenes, and human feelings".

Notwithstanding all this a list is made of non-Ciceronian words used in *Mago*. The extent of my vocabulary is eloquently discussed and I am described as "a champion of late and decadent Latin" who flouts "the dicta of classical custom" to such an extent that the reviewer, "a classical teacher who is deeply concerned about the integrity of his work", is compelled to ask "to what end, other than a familiarity with the slipshod methods and habits of inferior writers" my flouting leads.

Probably the Bible is as good a standard for classical English as Cicero for classical Latin and I must deplore the use of the word *flout* and other words which are not found in either the Old or the New Testament. Professor Forbes is not concerned, however, about the integrity of the Latin language or he would not wish to exclude from Rex those 109 acknowledged citizens of classical Rome. For him it is only the integrity of "his work". For him Latin literature is forever confined to the vocabulary of four ancient writers—as though for purposes of preparatory school English, *Treasure Island* should be rewritten in the words of Edmund Burke or it should be thought necessary to change Sherlock Holmes into the style and vocabulary of Milton.

So impressed, indeed, was Professor Forbes with the disfiguring effect of my "flotsam", of which he says my *Rex Aurei Rivi* contains on the average ten instances—classical and unclassical but anyhow wrong—to a page, that he devotes a page of *The Classical Journal* (11.30-31) to a story of a Haunted House so told in obsolete English and slang as to be nearly unintelligible. Over a hundred of these strange expressions are used on a single page adequately to illustrate my Latin style.

The burlesque loses its point because so far overdone. Had Professor Forbes limited himself to ten words on a page that could not be found in the Bible, and if, of these ten, four or five were well known classical English words and the other no more remote than "flotsam" and "flout", there would have been no burlesque.

The difference between us, however, can never be reached by these methods of burlesque. Professor Forbes's success as a teacher of preparatory Latin is fully recognized.

All Latin nevertheless is not preparatory Latin. When a boy has entered a College or when a young man has finished College, the question presses as to what the study of this language can do or has done for him.

To my mind a knowledge of the structure of language and the making of an English style are but part of the benefit. Latin was not only the language of the Roman Republic, and of the Roman Empire. It was for centuries the language of diplomacy, science and literature in Europe and an acquaintance with the Latin language brings the student into relation with original sources of history—turns the mind to the rise and fall of the institutions of civilization. Much of this Latin—considered merely as language—was barbarous. Much was excellent, and in it is the history of Europe and of great issues of modern intellectual life. Moreover, the Latin was a vigorous living language. It is quite possible, Professor Foster Watson